

CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION



(Back of Divider page for “Consultation and Coordination”

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Throughout the planning process, the planning team gathered public input on issues, proposed actions, and alternatives. The scoping process included interagency meetings, public workshops, newsletters, Advisory Commission meetings and the development of a homepage on the internet. These were used to identify the issues, alternatives, and impact topics to be considered for planning and to keep the public informed and involved throughout the planning process.

PUBLIC SCOPING AND WORKSHOPS

On August 31, 1995, a public notice describing the purpose of the planning effort was sent to the public, media, agencies, and other organizations on the Bureau of Land Management California Desert District's mailing list (about 6,000 names). The schedule for the first round of public meetings was included in the notice. On September 5, 1995, a notice of intent announcing the beginning of the planning process and the environmental impact statement was published in the *Federal Register*.

Public scoping workshops were held from September 21 through 27, 1995 at 10 locations throughout the planning area and in nearby areas where users live. These workshops were held in Pasadena, San Bernardino, Barstow, Baker, Needles, Ridgecrest, Independence, Lone Pine, and Furnace Creek, CA, and in Las Vegas, NV. About 250 people attended the workshops. These workshops were used to identify issues and concerns that the team should address in preparing separate agency management plans for the area. The team and other agency staff divided into two groups to cover the 10 locations in one week. Detailed notes taken during the workshops were summarized and placed in a notebook for the team's reference.

In late February 1997, a second notice was sent out to inform the public that there would be a second round of workshops in April focusing on conceptual alternatives. A press release was mailed to local media in and near the planning area. Some local newspapers and radio stations informed the public about the workshops. The schedule for these workshops was included in this notice and on the Northern and Eastern Mojave Planning Effort homepage.

Ten public workshops were held from April 14 through 24, 1997 at Las Vegas, Nevada, Needles, Furnace Creek, Bishop, Lone Pine, Barstow, Pasadena, San Bernardino, Baker, and Ridgecrest, California. Each workshop began with a 20-minute presentation by Northern and Eastern Mojave planning team leader Dennis Schramm about the planning effort and the conceptual alternatives that were arrayed in the newsletter. After the presentation the team would set up three stations for natural resources, cultural resources, land use, and visitor experience. At these stations, the team gathered comments and alternatives and wrote them down on the flipcharts. About 330 people attended the workshops.

In September 1998, Death Valley released a *Draft Environmental Impact Statement / General Management Plan*. Approximately 450 printed copies were distributed for review. In addition, about 100 CD-ROMs containing both 1998 draft Park plans were also sent. The plan was also posted on the internet with links from the Park's homepage and the Northern and Eastern Mojave planning page. The notice of availability was published in the *Federal Register* by the Environmental Protection Agency on September 11, 1998 (FR 48727). Written comments were accepted from September 11, 1998 through January 15, 1999, a period of 127 days. Eleven public meetings were held in October 1998 throughout the planning region of southern California and southern Nevada. At these meetings a form was provided for the public to write specific comments that they desired to be addressed by the planning team.

In addition, the planning team attended and participated in five meetings of the Death Valley Advisory Commission to obtain their feedback, concerns and direction regarding the development of the general management plan.

COMMENTS ON THE 1998 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT AND GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

Death Valley received approximately 600 comment letters from government agencies, tribes, interest groups, organizations, and individuals on the 1998 DEIS/GMP. In addition, members of three environmental groups (National Parks and Conservation Association, The Sierra Club, and The Wilderness Society) sent in approximately 1,800 identical postcards. Several additional letters and postcards were received after the closing date for public comments. All written comments are on file at Park headquarters.

The Environmental Protection Agency assigned a rating of “LO” (lack of objections) to the *1998 Draft Environmental Impact Statement* and commended the National Park Service for developing a quality management plan for the Park. Copies of this revised DEIS/ GMP are also provided to the EPA.

Agencies are directed to respond to substantive public comments received during the comment period on draft environmental impact statements. Comments are considered substantive when they: a) question, with reasonable basis, the accuracy of information in the DEIS, b) question, with reasonable basis, the adequacy of the environmental analysis, c) present reasonable alternatives other than those presented in the DEIS, or d) cause changes or revisions in the proposal. Comments that state a preference for one alternative (or component of an alternative), state opinions, or are outside the scope of the plan, are not considered substantive and responses are not provided. However, all letters are read and considered. Substantive comments were addressed by means of written responses, and where appropriate, by revisions to the text of the *1998 Draft Environmental Impact Statement* in this *Revised Draft Environmental Impact Statement*.

Largely due to public comments, substantial changes were made to the 1998 DEIS/GMP. Consequently, the National Park Service prepared a revised DEIS/GMP to address concerns raised and to solicit additional public review on the changes. Although not required, the NPS also chose to provide responses to the comments received on the 1998 DEIS/GMP in an attempt to clarify issues, address inaccuracies, and provide responses to questions raised on the 1998 DEIS/GMP. See the *Comments and Responses to the 1998 Draft Environmental Impact Statement and General Management Plan* document.

NEWSLETTERS AND HOMEPAGE

The first newsletter was sent out in February 1996 to about 6,000 names on the Bureau of Land Management mailing list for the California desert. It included a summary of planning issues identified at the public meetings and statements of purpose and significance for Death Valley National Park, Mojave National Preserve, and BLM-managed lands within the planning area.

The original mailing list was replaced with a planning specific mailing list developed from meeting participants, cooperating agencies, advisory commission members and letters received from the public. A second newsletter was sent in March 1997 to about 500 names on the Northern and Eastern Mojave Planning Effort mailing list. It contained a planning update, the schedule of the workshops, general descriptions of conceptual alternatives, and an outline of issues for which alternatives could be developed.

The newsletter was also posted on the homepage. Both newsletters include a one-page mailback for receiving comments.

In February 1997 a homepage for the three California desert planning efforts went online on the BLM California server. It contained detailed information about each planning effort, background information about the Mojave Desert, and the desert tortoise, pertinent legislation and maps and photographs. In April 1998 the Northern and Eastern Mojave Planning Effort homepage was moved to the NPS server so that the planning team would have direct access. The link to this homepage is found in Death Valley National Park's homepage (www.nps.gov/deva).

A third newsletter was sent out in April 1998 to the Northern and Eastern Mojave Planning Effort mailing list (which had grown to about 900 names) to update readers on the planning effort. The newsletter explained that three separate draft environmental impact statements for each area (Mojave National Preserve, Death Valley National Park, and the BLM public lands within the Northern and Eastern Mojave planning area) would be produced instead of one comprehensive draft environmental impact statement. A revised planning schedule and comment form for receiving the documents were also provided in the newsletter.

A one-page update along with a response form was mailed out to about 3,600 names on the mailing list in February 2000. This update served to inform those individuals and agencies of our current status and our intent to prepare a revised draft environmental impact statement (DEIS). It also requested return of a form identifying interest and desire for a copy of the revised DEIS.

AGENCY CONSULTATION

An interagency meeting was held on August 23, 1995, to discuss the issues to be addressed in this planning effort. The meeting was attended by 43 staff from the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

The California and Nevada state historic preservation officers were formally notified by letter in April 1996 of the planning effort. A response letter offering suggestions was received from the California state historic preservation officer in May 1996. A planning team member met briefly with the state historic preservation officer in June 1996 and offered a briefing on the planning effort. No date for the briefing was confirmed. Copies of the draft plan were sent to both offices for review. Brief comments were received from Nevada and are addressed in the separate comments and responses document.

Following the public scoping workshops in April 1997, another two-day interagency meeting was held in Barstow, California to discuss the alternatives and comments heard at the workshops. Twenty-eight staff members from the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the California State Parks, and San Bernardino County attended the two-day meeting. Comments were gathered on the first day and alternatives were developed on the second day.

An interagency meeting was held on April 10, 1997 to discuss listed and sensitive species in the planning area. It was decided that the team would plan for listed and sensitive species based on habitat types. A follow-up meeting was held on June 11, 1997, to continue the discussion. Habitat types were ranked according to priority, and tasks were assigned to staff members to gather information needed to map the habitats with the highest priority.

Consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on listed species was initiated in August 1998. The Las Vegas office dealt with the Devils Hole pupfish while the Ventura office handled the remainder of the

Park. Reinitiation of consultation on the revised DEIS/ GMP was begun in February 2000 based on changes made to the document.

Copies of the first internal agency combined draft environmental impact statement were provided to the Environmental Protection Agency in San Francisco. Copies of the separate draft plans for each Park unit were offered for review, but the Environmental Protection Agency declined to review these documents, opting instead to review and comment on the public drafts.

NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

On March 7, 1996, Team Leader Dennis Schramm, Death Valley National Park Superintendent Dick Martin, and Cultural Resources Specialist Linda Greene met with representatives of the Timbisha Shoshone Tribe at Death Valley. A follow-up meeting with tribal leaders was held at their offices in Death Valley on April 28, 1997. The purpose of these meetings was to initiate government-to-government relationships for the planning effort. The tribe was briefed on the scope and status of the planning effort and discussed issues.

Extensive government-to-government consultations have been conducted with the Timbisha Shoshone Tribe regarding land use matters. These consultations have resulted in the draft report "The Timbisha Shoshone Homeland" (1999) and the *Draft Legislative Environmental Impact Statement, Timbisha Shoshone Homeland* (2000).

An intertribal meeting involving the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe, Timbisha Shoshone Indian Tribe, Chemehuevi Indian Tribe and the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians was held on July 11, 1997 at the Fort Mohave Reservation's Avi Hotel and Casino in the Laughlin, NV area. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss Native American issues and alternatives. Invitation letters were sent to 13 tribal offices and to NPS and BLM staff. Seven representatives for the tribes and nine agency staff attended the meeting. Mr. William "Bill" Mungary (an intertribal leader) facilitated the meeting.

The meeting began with an introduction and greeting by Mr. Mungary followed by an overview of the planning effort by Team Leader Dennis Schramm. Then at their request, the tribes met for an hour and a half without the presence of the agencies. This was then followed by a three-hour discussion between the tribes and agencies that was focused on protection of cultural sites and access to these sites. The tribal representatives also addressed how they would want further consultation to be handled. Copies of the 1998 draft EIS/GMP were provided to the tribe for review and responses to their comments are addressed in the separate comments and responses document.

DEATH VALLEY NATIONAL PARK ADVISORY COMMISSION

Death Valley's Advisory Commission was appointed in September 1997. A series of meetings were held in Death Valley on November 20, 1997, January 8 and 9, 1998, February 11 and 12, 1998, April 22 and 23, 1998, and September 1998. During these meetings, the commission members were briefed on the planning process and schedule, major issues, Park operations and took a field trip through Saline Valley to see some of the issues firsthand. Copies of the draft EIS/GMP were provided to commission members for review, and the commission was briefed on the document during the public review period. A letter was sent by the commission providing comments on the plan and is included in the comments and responses document.

INVITED COOPERATING AGENCIES

At the initiation of the Northern and Eastern Mojave planning effort, a letter was sent to the following agencies advising them of the planning scope and purpose, and inviting their participation as cooperators, or to designate a planning contact. Those marked with an asterisk designated a planning contact.

FEDERAL:

Bureau of Indian Affairs*
National Training Center - Ft. Irwin*
China Lake Naval Air Weapons Center
Army Corp of Engineers
Environmental Protection Agency
Inyo National Forest

STATE:

California Department of Fish and Game
California Department of Parks and Recreation*
California Department of Transportation (Districts 8 & 9)
State Lands Commission
California State Historic Preservation Office*
Nevada State Historic Preservation Office

LOCAL:

County of San Bernardino, CA*
County of Inyo, CA*
County of Mono, CA
Clark County, NV*
Nye County, NV
Esmeralda County, NV

NATIVE AMERICAN:

Timbisha Shoshone Indian Tribe*
Fort Mohave Indian Tribe
Chemehuevi Indian Tribe

LIST OF AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS TO WHOM COPIES OF THE DRAFT PLAN WERE SENT

Federal Agencies

Department of Agriculture

Natural Resource Conservation Service, Mojave District

Department of the Army

Army Corp of Engineers, Sacramento District

Army Corp of Engineers, Los Angeles District

Department of Defense

China Lake Naval Weapons Station

National Training Center, Ft. Irwin

Department of the Interior

Bureau of Indian Affairs, Sacramento

Bureau of Indian Affairs, Southern California Agency, Riverside

Bureau of Land Management, California State Office

Bureau of Land Management, Desert District, Riverside

Bureau of Land Management, Barstow Field Office, CA

Bureau of Land Management, Needles Field Office, CA

Bureau of Land Management, Nevada State Office

Bureau of Land Management, Ridgecrest Field Office, CA

Bureau of Land Management, Las Vegas Field Office, NV

Bureau of Land Management, Tonopah Field Office, NV

Fish and Wildlife Service, Field Office, Ventura

National Park Service, Death Valley National Park

National Park Service, Denver Service Center

National Park Service, Mojave National Preserve

National Park Service, Pacific West Region

National Park Service, Joshua Tree National Park

National Park Service, Lake Mead National Recreation Area

National Park Service, Sequoia/Kings Canyon National Park

National Park Service, Washington, D.C.

National Park Service, Water Resources Division

U.S. Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division, Colorado Plateau

U.S. Geological Survey, Canyon Crest Field Station

Eastern Sierra Interagency Visitor Center

Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX

Forest Service, Inyo National Forest

Federal Advisory Groups

Death Valley National Park Advisory Commission

Elected Officials

U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer, California

U.S. Senator Dianne Feinstein, California

U.S. Senator Richard Bryan, Nevada

U.S. Senator Harry Reid, Nevada
U.S. Representative Jerry Lewis, California
U.S. Representative Shelley Berkeley, Nevada
U.S. Representative Jim Gibbons, Nevada
Governor Gray Davis, California
Governor Kenny Guinn, Nevada

State Agencies

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology
California Department of Fish and Game
California Department of Parks and Recreation
California Department of Transportation, District 8
California Department of Transportation, District 9
California Federation of Mineralogical Society
California State Historic Preservation Officer
California State Lands Commission
California State University, Fullerton
Nevada Division of Minerals
Nevada State Historic Preservation Officer
University of California, Los Angeles

Local Agencies

Baker Community Service District
Big Pine Chamber of Commerce
City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Engineering
Clark County, Nevada, Department of Parks and Recreation
Clark County, Nevada, Department of Comprehensive Planning
Death Valley Chamber of Commerce
Esmeralda County Board of Commissioners
Indian Wells Valley Water District
Inyo County Agricultural Department
Inyo County Board of Supervisors
Inyo County Planning Department
Kern County Board of Supervisors
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power
Mono County Board of Supervisors
Mono County Planning Department
Nye County Board of Commissioners
Nye County Department of Natural Resources and Federal Facilities
Pinon Mesa Middle School
San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors
Town of Amargosa

Organizations

American Motorcycle Association, District 37
Animal Protection Institute
Barrick Bullfrog Inc
BLM Lands Foundation

Blue Ribbon Coalition
California Association of 4-Wheel Drive Clubs
California Deserts Tourism Association
California Lichen Society
California Off-Road Vehicle Association
Center for Biological Diversity
Chatsworth Womens Club
Committee for Responsible Growth
The Conservation Fund
Death Valley 49' ers
Death Valley Hiker Association
Death Valley Natural History Association
Desert Botanical Garden
Desert Survivors
Eastern Sierra Audubon Society
Environmental Management Associates
F.M. Myrick Research
Friends of the Mojave Road
Furnace Creek Inn & Ranch Resort
Gear Grinders
Genesis Gold Corp
Gold Valley Ranch
High Desert Multiple Use Coalition
Las Vegas Gem Club
Landells Aviation
Lilburn Corporation
Molycorp, Inc.
National Parks and Conservation Association
Natural Resources Defense Council
Needles Gem and Mineral
OMYA
Pahrump Public Lands Advisory Board
People for the U.S.A.
People for the West
Ponderosa Dairy
Public Lands Council
Rainforest Action Network
Recon
Red Rock Audubon
Restore: The North Woods
Sage Associates
Saline Preservation Association
The Sierra Club
The Sierra Club, Angeles Chapter
Society for the Conservation of Bighorn Sheep
Southwest Forest Alliance
Tierra Del Sol Four Wheel Drive Club of San Diego
U.S. Borax Inc.
Wild Burro Rescue and Preservation Project
The Wilderness Society

Wilderness Watch

Tribal Governments

Timbisha Shoshone Tribe
Pascua Yaqui Tribal Council
Colorado River Tribe

Libraries

Amargosa Public Library
Angeles Mesa Library
Balboa Library
Beatty Library
Boulder City Library
California State University, Long Beach Main Library
Calif. State Univ., Northridge, Oviatt Library
Clark County Library
Henderson Public Library San Bernardino County Library, Administration
Inyo County Free Library, Bishop Branch Library
Inyo County Free Library, Death Valley Branch
Inyo County Free Library, Lone Pine Branch Library
Las Vegas Public Library
Mohave County Library
Napa City County Library
Nevada State Library
Pahrump Library
Pasadena Public Library Pasadena Public Library
Ridgecrest Library
Sacramento Central Library
San Bernardino County Library, Barstow Branch
San Bernardino County Library, Needles Branch
San Bernardino County Library, Victorville Branch
San Francisco Public Library, Civic Center
Seattle Public Library
Shasta County Library
Sunrise Public Library
University of Arizona Library
University of California, Davis, Shields Library
University of California, Irvine, Main Library
University of Nevada, Las Vegas, James R. Dickinson Library

Approximately 350 individuals were sent either printed or CD-ROM version of the plan. The plan is also posted on the internet.